

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-24 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1 and 11 are amended for clarification. Basis for these amendments may be found in the specification at paragraphs [0031] and [0032].

Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Huang. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection. In particular, Huang does not disclose or suggest that "when the display content includes both turned on and turned off pixels, ... the segment electrode drive voltage waveforms are formed so that there is a period of time during which the same voltage is applied to all segment electrodes at the same time during the step of writing the display content," as required by claim 1 or that "the controller controls the common and segment driver in such a way that each of the reset, select, hold, non-select, ON and OFF voltage waveforms has the same number of unit intervals, the reset, select, hold, non-select voltage waveforms have no more than two levels of voltages in the same unit interval, and the ON and OFF voltage waveforms have not more than two levels of voltages in the same unit interval," as required by claim 11.

In the Office Action it is asserted that Huang discloses this feature of the invention at column 10, lines 16-32 when the display is written and every pixel in the display is off. This, however, is different from Applicant's claim 1 which requires the display content to include both turned-on and turned-off pixels. As shown in Figs 6A through 6D, the column voltages used by Huang are different for turned on (twisted planar) pixels and turned off (focal conic) pixels. Thus, if the display includes both turned-on and turned-off pixels, there will be no time in which "the same voltage is applied to all segment electrodes at the same time during the step of writing the display content."

Because Huang does not disclose or suggest this limitation of claim 1, claim 1 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Huang. Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Huang for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

In the Office Action, it is asserted that the above-referenced feature of claim 11 is disclosed in Figs 6A through 6D of Huang. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion.

In particular, as shown in Figs 6A through 6D, during the first unit interval, the V_{ROW} signal has four different levels (VP1, VS1, VE1 and VN1) during the preparation, selection, evolution and holding stages. By contrast, as shown for example in Figs. 7A and 7B and as described in paragraphs [0031] and [0032], the COM waveform has only two levels during any one of the unit intervals across all of the reset, select, hold and non-select waveforms. The same is true of the SEG waveform.

Because Huang does not disclose at least this feature of claim 11, claim 11 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Huang. Claims 12-24 depend from claim 11 and are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Huang for at least the same reasons as claim 11.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-24.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549
Attorney(s) for Applicant(s)

KNN/pb

Dated: September 4, 2008